

Hunter Elandt

Prueter, 1st Hour

2/26/18

Throughout the history of mankind, many powerful nations have risen up and thrived for years due to the success of their society and their leadership. What differed amongst these many powerful individuals were the ways in which they chose to direct their people. Some chose to be seen as all powerful and keep the people in fear of them, while others followed a more peaceful path, and included the people in their decision making. Both have their advantages and disadvantages, but in the end, collaborative leadership is what truly allows a nation to reach its full potential. One man/woman can not run society on their own, which is why allowing the public to make decisions as well as those in higher positions is essential for success. At the same time, a positive relationship built between those in power and the “common” people creates a level of trust and companionship that binds a nation together as a whole.

The most powerful of societies have been built not only on the work of the leader, but the work of the people. As we’ve seen from our own system of Democracy, the president alone can not run the country. His power is limited in what he is able to do, which is why he counts on the state governments, local governments, etc to help govern each area that he alone could not do by himself. The states have the freedom to make

their own laws, while at the same time still abiding by federal rules and regulations. In a quote by George S. Patton, "Don't tell people how to do things, tell them what to do and let them surprise you with their results." The nation continues to thrive due to the collaborative effort of the people and their decision making, and the individual in power and their executive voice. This conjoined force allows for a more peaceful society, where logic and reason take precedence. A leader will never be truly great until they show qualities of which can be found in a philosopher (Plato), but collaborative leadership brings us one step closer to this overall goal.

The relationship between a leader and his/her people is paramount when it comes to ensuring the prosperity of any nation. If people do not trust their head of state, then calamity is sure to ensue. "[Men] are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, and covetous (Machiavelli). It should be a main goal of any person in power to create a positive relationship with their citizens. This not only builds trust that is needed when it comes to governing a nation, but also builds a sense of companionship amongst the powerful individual and the people. A more direct relationship is constructed that makes people want to follow their leader. As like the relationship between a child and their parents, a child may protest against a parent's decision, but they will do so mildly, and still maintain respect for them (Confucius). This same relationship holds true when collaborative leadership is in play. Disagreements will come up, but they will always be worked out in a respectful manner among the people and those they follow. Without this, peace and prosperity can not happen.

Others with a differing opinion may argue that some of the most powerful and successful nations that the world has ever seen have risen up out of authoritative leadership. Some of these instances include the almighty French empire under the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte who led his armies in conquering many other countries as seen in a famous painting by David Jacques-Louis. Another of these is Nazi Germany under the rule of Adolf Hitler. While many of his tactics included hate and fear, he led his fellow Nazis to the conquering of many surrounding countries, and like Napoleon, expanded Nazi territory well beyond the borders of Germany. They were both very intelligent and were able to gain followers through fear, but their main downfall was their seclusion from the people. The followers “[conferred] all their power and strength upon one man (Hobbes), which gave up their political voice and any say they had at all . The voice of their leader became law. What the people thought became pointless, and their opinions did not matter to their leaders. This in turn led to the downfall of both of these powerhouse nations. As explained above, one man can not run a nation on his own, and trying to do so eventually caught up to these two, and they were swiftly defeated. Collaborative leadership does not cause this dilemma, as both the leader and the people contribute to the decisions made in society and in government. This greater variation in ideas allows for more innovations in technology, strategies, etc, that increase the probability of survival for a nation. This type of leadership encourages the survival of a nation as a whole, while authoritative guarantees a short lifespan.

In the end, Collaborative leadership comes out on top as the method to follow when leading a nation. It allows for a leader to create a society in which representation

for the people is not put into question, and innovation comes a rate not possible by others methods. If the U.S were run authoritatively, there's no question as to how many difficulties we would face. Collaborative leadership how allowed this country to thrive for almost 250 years, and will continue to drive it forward into the future ahead.